



*Oral
History
Program*



*Oral
History
Program*

Jan L. Tyler

Interviewed by John R. Sillito
11 March 1980

Oral History Program
Weber State University
Stewart Library
Ogden, Utah

Jan L. Tyler

Interviewed by
John R. Sillito
University Archivist

11 March 1980

Mission Statement

The Oral History Program of the Stewart Library was created to preserve the institutional history of Weber State University and the Davis, Ogden and Weber County communities. By conducting carefully researched, recorded, and transcribed interviews, the Oral History Program creates archival oral histories intended for the widest possible use.

Interviews are conducted with the goal of eliciting from each participant a full and accurate account of events. The interviews are transcribed, edited for accuracy and clarity, and reviewed by the interviewees (as available), who are encouraged to augment or correct their spoken words. The reviewed and corrected transcripts are indexed, printed, and bound with photographs and illustrative materials as available. The working files, original recording, and archival copies are housed in the University Archives.

Project Description

The Weber State College Oral History Program was created in the early 1970s to “record and document, through personal reminiscences, the history, growth and development of Weber State College.” Through interviews with administrators, faculty and students, the program’s goal was to expand the documentary holdings on Weber State College and its predecessor entities. From 1970 to 1976, the program conducted some fifteen interviews, under the direction of, and generally conducted by Harold C. Bateman, an emeritus professor of history. In 1979, under the direction of archivist John Sillito, the program was reestablished and six interviews were conducted between 1979 and 1983. Additional interviews were conducted by members of the Weber State community.

Oral history is a method of collecting historical information through recorded interviews between a narrator with firsthand knowledge of historically significant events and a well-informed interviewer, with the goal of preserving substantive additions to the historical record. Because it is primary material, oral history is not intended to present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a spoken account. It reflects personal opinion offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it is partisan, deeply involved, and irreplaceable.

Rights Management

This work is the property of the Weber State University, Stewart Library Oral History Program. It may be used freely by individuals for research, teaching and personal use as long as this statement of availability is included in the text.

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Tyler, Jan L., an oral history by John R. Sillito, 11 March 1980, WSU Stewart Library Oral History Program, University Archives, Stewart Library, Weber State University, Ogden, UT.



Jan L. Tyler

Abstract: The following is an oral history interview with Jan L. Tyler (born 1942). Ms. Tyler served as Assistant Dean of Students at Weber State College from 1971 to 1974. The interview was conducted on March 11, 1980 by John R. Sillito in order to gather Ms. Tyler's recollections and experiences with Weber State College.

JS: This is an oral interview with Jan Tyler being conducted on 11 March 1980 at her condominium in Salt Lake City, Utah. The interviewer is John Sillito. I think the best place to begin is with some biographical background. Why don't you tell us where you were born; your parent's names; and something about your educational background prior to coming to Utah.

JT: I was born on Thursday, September 10, 1942 in California. My father's name is Rufus Lloyd Tyler and my mother's name is Shirley Ellen Blackmer. We lived in California; but of course this was during the Second World War, so when my father went into the Navy we moved to Twin Falls, Idaho. We lived there for several years. Actually, in my growing up days, after my father came back from the war, we lived in Burley, Buhl, Weiser and Twin Falls, Idaho, then Kennewick, and Walla Walla, Washington. From the time I was in the 7th grade through high school we lived in Walla Walla; my family is still there.

JS: So when you think of home you think of Washington?

JT: Yes, even though my birth place is California. I have no attachment to Idaho.

JS: You said you lived in Washington until you graduated from high school. Where did you go to school after that?

JT: I graduated from high school in 1960 and went to Brigham Young University for my undergraduate days from 1960 to 1964. I graduated in speech, drama and music. Then I auditioned and was selected to go with the first BYU semester abroad program. I sang with a performing group from February to July, 1965.

JS: After you graduated?

JT: Yes, after I graduated. I studied music and political science there in Salzburg, Austria. Then I came back home and worked for two years for the National Park Service and a law and accounting firm to earn enough money to get my masters. I went to Arizona State University in Tempe.

JS: Why did you choose Arizona State?

JT: Well, I didn't! Actually, I had applied for fellowships both at the University of Washington in Seattle and at ASU, and I said, if I get the fellowship in Seattle, then I'll go on in music; if I get the one in Arizona then I'll go on and get my masters in counseling. Well it turned out I got a fellowship from both places so I still had to make a decision.

JS: Were you in vocal music and instrumental music?

JT: Yes, piano, organ, keyboard. When I was in high school I played the woodwinds, clarinet, and in marching band I played the drum.

JS: So how did Arizona State win out? Those are two very diverse career opportunities it seems to me.

JT: Really it was the warm weather! I just said, "Okay, I have to make a decision; I'm going to Arizona and I'm going on in counseling." Also, it's very difficult unless you're into pop music to make a living in music in America. I could have stayed in

Europe, which I considered doing, but I didn't, and so when I came back here I knew music would always have to be a sideline and if I wanted anything serious I had to be able to make my living along with it.

JS: What led you to consider counseling as an option?

JT: Probably because I'm the oldest of eight children and I've always had people come to me. Even in junior high and high school, and in college, it seemed like people felt very comfortable using me as a sounding board, or confiding in me. I gained a real interest in human nature, and so at some point in my life I knew that I would cultivate that. But really I think the "click" for me was in Austria as we were giving our final concert. I looked over the group that was the audience, and they were now our friends. The first concert we'd given we didn't even know who they were, and now we saw many friends in the audience. And suddenly, I had this longing to know something more about the people out there than their faces. As a performer you really don't get to know people, even though people are a very important part of your performance, because we use them in our interactions.

And suddenly it became important to me to know people on an individual basis and to understand human nature better. I didn't choose straight psychology because I'm more interested in working with a normal person going through every day kinds of crises and typical neuroses and those kinds of things. So I wasn't interested in getting into heavy clinical stuff such as working with people who are going through unusual kinds of crises.

JS: So you came to a point in your life where you decided that you were a people-oriented person as opposed to a thing-oriented person?

JT: Right, although I loved ideas and I spend a lot of times with ideas. I read five to eight books a week, and many of my friends are people who enjoy intellectual conversations and exploring ideas. But in terms of activities, I'm much happier working directly with people.

JS: You received a masters from ASU in what year?

JT: I started in 1967 and finished in 1969.

JS: You didn't join the faculty at Weber until 1971. What did you do during that two year period?

JT: I continued working at Arizona State in the office of vice president of student affairs. Most of my experience was in housing, and that's how I met the student personnel people at Weber.

JS: Why don't you tell us the circumstances that led to your coming to Weber, and in the process evaluate what you at that time considered the pros and the cons about Weber, both in terms of your own personal career, and also in terms of the school itself.

JT: All right. I was involved with student personnel at ASU and in the process came to know some of the people in student personnel at Weber.

JS: Who were some of those people?

JT: Alan Dayley, Karl Wood, and it seems to me that I had also met Marv Peterson. Probably those three were the ones I knew and some others that aren't there and I don't even remember their names. Arizona State was sponsoring a student

personnel conference and it was at that time that I learned of the position at Weber. This was about March or something like that. And so in the process of talking about it, somebody suggested that I might want to apply for the position. I said that I would be very interested in doing that; but I was applying at a number of different places and wanted to learn more about the institution. I found out that Weber was about the size of places that I was looking at in other Western states. But, I wasn't really giving Weber that much consideration; I was throwing it into the hopper with everything else.

JS: Were there specific detractors that made you put less emphasis on Weber as opposed to other schools? I mean were there things about Weber that bothered you?

JT: No, at that time it was just simply an exploratory stage, and I was just gathering information. I really was trying to be as open as I could and yet have it very clear in my mind what kind of experience I wanted. After visiting other campuses and so forth, Weber sounded very attractive but I had never been on that campus. So, after a convention in Las Vegas instead of going directly back to Phoenix, I routed myself to Salt Lake and took a day to visit Weber. I was introduced to President Miller and had a very delightful visit with him. I was also introduced to Vice President Hofmann, and though our meeting was brief, I remember it being a very positive exchange. I think it was Alan Dayley who took me around, and I talked with several of the people who were interested in student personnel. Then I took a tour of the campus. After being formally escorted, I walked around on my own and just stopped and talked to secretaries, a janitor working in the Union

building, and students in the bookstore, just to try to get a feel of the school. I was so impressed, it seemed like everybody felt like they had a part, a responsibility in the institution. And I found that quite remarkable.

JS: What gave you that feeling?

JT: Well, one factor was because it wasn't too big; it was small enough. Also, I feel very strongly President Miller's leadership style appeared to be very inclusive, and people genuinely did feel that they had a part in what was happening.

JS: So a large part of it was President Miller himself?

JT: Yes, I think that his leadership style certainly had an influence on how people felt.

JS: What you've talked about is all positive. What were some of the negative factors?

JT: There were two things I had some concerns about. One was that I was aware there was an individual, another woman, on campus who was also being considered for the position. She had been on campus for some time; she had a history on the campus and so forth; and in accepting the position I had some concerns whether or not we would be able to get along. Then the other concern was that it was not very clear (and maybe I purposely avoided finding out) about the transition which would take place between me and the person who held that position before I came in.

JS: Now that was Marva Gregory?

JT: Yes. I was very sensitive to the fact that I, a young person just having received my degree with maybe four or five years of experience, would be stepping into a position that had been held by a person who was a native of the state, had a long history with the institution, and obviously had made a tremendous contribution.

And initially, there was some tension until Marva and I got to know each other on a personal basis. Since then I don't get the impression, from her at least, that there is any kind of bad feeling between us. I think we both understand what happened and it was painful for her and it was hard for me stepping in.

JS: So in essence was she being demoted and they were bringing in someone new?

JT: Yes, she had been Dean of Women, and she was transferred over to the counseling area, I think, until she retired.

JS So your main concern was the perception of not having sufficient training and experience. Was this a faculty position?

JT: Yes, I had both administrative and faculty status.

JS: At that time?

JT: Yes, I was Assistant Professor of Student Personnel and Assistant Dean of Students (Dean of Women).

JS: What were your own hopes, when you took the job? What did you want to accomplish? I am asking this because when people think of you today, they remember your involvement in women's issues. Was that as strong in your mind at that time or were there other things that were as strong or stronger?

JT: Well, my interest in women's issues began at Arizona State University (of which the president at that time was G. Homer Durham) where I served on the Commission on the Status of Women. I handled the staff part of that commission. I was flung into this ocean of information and suddenly realized what was happening. I realized the impact attitudes toward women were having upon

women within institutions of higher education whether they were faculty, staff, administrators, students, whatever.

JS: Did you think of yourself as feminist before that time?

JT: I have never thought of myself as a feminist.

JS: Do you today?

JT: I am called that, but I hesitate referring to myself as a feminist just as I do not refer to myself as a Mormon, because other people have definitions of what that means, and I have my own. I have such deep feelings about those things, and I don't like them violated by having other peoples definitions imposed on me. So, I don't really refer to myself that way.

JS: Let me rephrase the question a little bit.

JT: Okay.

JS: Was this the first time that you became particularly interested in the plight of women in higher education, as well as some of the larger issues involving not only recognition of women, but sexism in society?

JT: ASU was my initiation.

JS: Prior to that time you hadn't really addressed those issues.

JT: Oh, I had always had personal, private concerns about it, but it had never really come to the fore until the late 60's. I was reasonably new, maybe four or five years old into that awareness, when I moved here.

JS: What then were your hopes in that regard at Weber?

JT: Originally, as I was looking at all the institutions, I had not thought in terms of a position working specifically with women. But I remember the first time that I

walked on the campus at ASU. I was introduced to the Dean of Women, Dr. Kathryn Nicholes, she was an older woman with a fine reputation throughout the United States. She looked me straight in the eye and said, "What do you intend to do after you get your degree here?" She was the one partially responsible for me getting my assistantship, and I looked her straight in the eye and said, "I intend to one day be a Dean of Women just like you." (You will see a little later that is a pattern of mine, because I made a similar comment to President Bishop.) And she just laughed and said, "Of course, you'll do it." I knew that at some point I would, but I had no idea that I would do it at such a young age. To my knowledge I was one of, if not the, youngest woman holding a position like that in the nation.

JS: You were what, about thirty?

JT: Twenty-nine. I was well aware of that when I attended Deans' meetings on a national level, even on the state level. At that time Deans' meetings were held in the state. And so I was aware of my youth, and really in projecting where I would be, I thought maybe somewhere in my 30's I would emerge.

JS: What were your perceptions of women at Weber State?

JT: There were several goals I wanted to accomplish. One was that I wanted to take whatever existing women's programs there were and make them strong, especially in teaching women leadership skills. I perceived myself more a facilitator, helping people accomplish the things that they wanted to do and using that process as a teaching experience, kind of like a laboratory experience really. And so I found myself in a position to help facilitate people in the process of

accomplishing what they wanted. Also, my hope was to establish some kind of women's center, and a commission similar to the one that I had been a part of and seen work so effectively.

JS: Now this was a university-wide commission at Arizona State?

JT: Yes. It was comprised of administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

JS: Was this a part of a larger trend in Arizona, or was it specifically at Arizona State?

JT: To my knowledge, G. Homer Durham was one of the first presidents of any university or college to establish such a commission. There were others, but in the West we might have been the first, and maybe the only one. One of the things that might have influenced him was that one of the commissioners from the national level was a resident of the state and she was the one that officially commissioned it.

JS: Who was that?

JT: Jacqueline Gutwillig. Also, we had one of the national officers of the Association of Women Students, Karen Kessling, who was on our campus. She was very aware of the kinds of trends that were going on, and she was instrumental in bringing people together so that things could take place.

JS: So it was from this foundation that you came to Weber hoping to do similar things to what you'd experienced at Arizona State?

JT: Yes, and hoping that they would be as effective and productive as those at ASU.

JS: Did you have the feeling that there was rapport between you and other administrators, and good feelings on campus that would permit you to do some of these things. Did you have any fears of a conservative reaction to your efforts?

JT: No, you see in Arizona I was perceived as conservative. I was very naive because I assumed there would be a conservative atmosphere; and because of the way that I was treated within that context, --

JS: At Weber?

JT: No, Arizona. -- I perceived and defined myself as a very conservative person; because against the relief of all that was going on during the late sixties, I always held what was perceived the conservative line.

JS: So you didn't see yourself as a flaming, young, liberal?

JT: No, no.

JS: Going to Weber State didn't change anything?

JT: No, it did not.

JS: Do you think people at the college perceived you in more liberal terms?

JT: Some possibly did, but I think that perception was one that emerged later. Initially, I don't think I was viewed that way.

JS: So you don't feel there were any problems that way in terms of an initial perception of you that caused problems later.

JT: No.

JS: Let's talk about the organizational structure at Weber. You were hired to be the Dean of Women as I understand it; now things were somewhat restructured at that time, as opposed to the way they had been when Marva Gregory was Dean

of Women. What were the changes that were made? Also, will you explain what you envisioned the Women's Environ to be?

JT: Actually as I arrived there was reorganization going on. I understood that the title of "Dean of Men" was being changed to the "Assistant Dean of Students" and that the title of "Dean of Women" would be comparable, but the feeling was that the responsibilities would be the same. Initially, I thought that was fine; I mean I didn't know enough to say that it wasn't fine. But then I realized that this was a trend happening nationally, and was one way that institutions were getting rid of women's visibility. I saw it happen at ASU with women in student personnel, making them less visible, whether it was a conscious effort or not. I continued, for political reasons, to refer to myself as Dean of Women as most of the students did; but officially I was the Assistant Dean of Students.

JS: So your responsibility was formal and your title was Assistant Dean of Students. Now who was the Dean of Students?

JT: Alan Dayley.

JS: Who was the Assistant Dean of Students for men?

JT: Marvin Peterson.

JS: So this was a part of the overall process of administrative changes on campus at the time. Now when you came to campus, William Miller was president wasn't he?

JT: Right.

JS: How long was it from the time you came until President Miller retired?

JT: I believe it was about a year.

JS: So you worked with President Miller for about a year. We want to talk a little bit later about your perceptions of him and the differences between his style of leadership and that of President Bishop. Now tell me about the Women's Environ. What, in your own mind, did you hope to accomplish with that institute?

JT: As I conceptualized it, I broke it into four different areas: research, information, services and educational studies.

JS: Tell me a little bit more of how you envisioned those four things working at Weber State.

JT: I hoped under the research area that we could establish a commission similar to the one at Arizona State and that it would include all four categories: students, staff, faculty and administration.

JS: So that would be a commission on the status of women?

JT: At Weber State College, and the purpose would be to discover what the status of women was, and to do research to suggest ways that things could be improved and equalized. The disappointing thing for me was that at no point could we get agreement from faculty women to include students. There was a very different attitude at Weber, which I was not prepared for, because students were so much included in the decision-making and participation at ASU, which was a much bigger institution. But Weber was still very paternalistic and, "you don't relate to students as equals because you just don't" was the attitude. There was a very strong feeling about not including students and somehow protecting them from information that might come up.

JS: Now this was mostly on the part of faculty members?

JT: Yes.

JS: What about the participation of staff and administration?

JT: There was also some very strong feeling but the staff and administrators were initially included; whether they still are or not, I don't know.

JS: So it was mostly a feeling that they didn't want to have students involved on this commission.

JT: Not from the staff; the staff felt okay about students being involved.

JS: Right, but on the part of the faculty. Was this commission to be made up totally of women or were there men and women?

JT: It was conceptualized as totally women on the commission, but as they did their areas of research there would be men involved in the project.

JS: Were there some powerful women on the campus then, women who held significant, important administrative positions for example, women who were clearly leaders?

JT: Well, I think, Dr. Jean Kunz, who was head of the Department of Family Life there; Genevieve Wise in that same college; Dr. Leola Davidson, who was head of nursing; and Dr. Jean White of political science are the ones that come to mind. I think they were very much a part of the initial impetus for this.

JS: With the exception of yourself, was there anybody else in the administration who was female?

JT: No, I think I was the only one. As I recall, come to think of it, there was finally a point where I was allowed to attend the President's Council meetings and I remember being the only woman there.

JS: Was this under President Bishop?

JT: Yes.

JS: So then the goal of the research aspect of the Environ was to organize a commission on the status of women at Weber State College. Was that accomplished?

JT: Partially it was accomplished.

JS: Was there a clear delineation of what the commission should be doing?

JT: Well the first task that it considered, which was very crucial, was to participate in the equalization process.

JS: Salaries?

JT: Salaries, yes. That was really a crucial task and beyond that, I don't know.

JS: What was the differential between male and female salaries? Was there quite a wide gap then?

JT: There was a wide gap and that's why the state legislature designated equalization funds to go to the various institutions of higher education.

JS: So this had been recognized prior to the time?

JT: It had been kept very secret though. By accident some of us found out from a legislator that these funds had been disbursed to the campuses, and women-- even in the administration positions on the campus across the state (I'm talking about Logan, Weber, Salt Lake)—were not even aware that these funds had been appropriated and that they were to be disbursed specifically to equalize salaries. So each one of us went to our administrators and got different stories about why we weren't aware of it. Then we met together which was really the

beginning of the Consortium of Utah Women in Higher Education, which is still going very strong. And we decided that we really needed to share information and figure out strategies, so each one of us went back to our respective institutions and finally each campus had women involved in the process of equalization of funds.

JS: So there was a similar commission at other schools in the state or at least similar approaches.

JT: I think the most effective women's center and commission still functioning is at Logan.

JS: At Utah State?

JT: Yes, there is none at any other institution in the state that I am aware of.

JS: Is the Women's Resource Center at the University of Utah a spinoff of this kind of thing?

JT: They started, I think, the very same year that the Women's Environ did.

JS: What about the second category, that of information. How did you envision that?

JT: We began to collect books and files on a couple of hundred topics and subscribed to magazines so that we would have a current constant flow of information coming in regarding women.

JS: A resource file?

JT: Yes.

JS: Was this to be used by the administration?

JT: Anybody.

JS: So you think that that was one of the most successful aspects of the Environ?

JT: Yes, I think the unfortunate thing however is that at the time I left all of those materials were dispersed to different places, and now I don't even know what's happened to them, or if there is such a place to gain information.

JS: What about Women's Studies, what did you envision that way?

JT: Eventually in each college there would be a curriculum that would include the perspective of women as well as the perspective of men which was already being presented. And so I explored that by initiating a course I taught through the Honors program, and also Genevieve Wise had been teaching a course called Women in Today's Society, or something like that. She was working on a higher degree and she invited me to come in and teach it, so that was already going and had been going probably a couple years, before I even came on campus.

JS: So you were kind of building on a precedent or an atmosphere that things needed to be done?

JT: There was some attention but not very much response.

JS: I see, and the goal was to develop women's studies programs in the individual departments as opposed to a women's study program.

JT: Right.

JS: Other than the class you mentioned was this aspect successful; were there lots of departments who began to take a look at Women's issues?

JT: No; really all I had the opportunity of doing was getting a feel of what was happening in the Department of Family Life, and then I designed and ended up teaching this other class for the Honors program. So that was all I had done

when I left the institution. The next step would have been to build committees and cross the various academic areas.

JS: What about the fourth category, services; what did you envision in that?

JT: Well, we did seminars on different topics that were of current concerns. We would examine various topics regarding women that were current and we tried to present all perspectives.

JS: I see. In the catalog the description, which I assume you wrote, of the Women's Environ, had the stated goal of promoting the conservation and more effective utilization of all human resources. Then you go on to say the Environ seeks to create an atmosphere which allows men and women the opportunity to discover that feminine values and attributes are as highly valued as male values or ethnic values, etc. If you were writing a description of the institute today would you approach it in the same way?

JT: No.

JS: Do you think that was a mistake? In other words when I read this I saw some things that could be construed as perhaps politically necessary: you talk about remaining open and honest, being a part of the college, that sort of thing. I get the feeling that perhaps there was some hesitation on the part of some at the college for the institute itself. Is that true?

What I'm wondering is whether there was an attempt on your part to placate some people by demonstrating that this was not a women's lib program?

JT: Not really because I didn't even have that kind of consciousness then.

JS: Did others up there have that kind of view?

JT: They may have; but you know this was all new, it was really a new frontier in setting up the Women's Environ, and I had no models to follow. I did make a trip from Logan all the way down to St. George talking to women in similar positions to the one that I held, and in the process, discovered the University of Utah was also making a similar consideration. But, as I talked with these women, it was really two of us, Dr. Virginia Frobes of the U of U and I, sitting down and sharing ideas about what could and should be happening; but no real models to follow.

JS: What about the budget and support; did you feel like the administration was willing to budget enough money to support you administratively, to make the institute a success?

JT: No. There was some money allocated from the Institutional Council, and the first year we were able to move ahead somewhat but it became very difficult because I was really functioning in two full-time jobs, and so I was putting in a lot of time elsewhere. Because it was new, or maybe because I was very naive in my approach, there was some suspicion. So I spent a lot of time talking with people, listening to their concerns and trying to respond to the things they were concerned about.

JS: What were some of these concerns as you recall?

JT: Well, I think people accepted the idea that we needed to do something for women, but I think it was a frightening thing to men and women, not only to take it on, but to realize that they might have a part in the process of trying to solve some of these problems. I don't approach things from a basis of fear, and even though I may not have all the answers, I am not afraid to try and take a risk.

JS: To ask questions?

JT: Yes. I had the feeling that maybe a lot of nervousness was coming from people who had been on the campus for a long time and had experienced discrimination or had fears, some of which were unfounded, some of which were founded. And so that's where they were coming from, but I did not have any previous negative experiences up to that point.

JS: I see. Was there class solidarity among women in the past?

JT: You mean was there a unity among women on campus? No. I think that was the thing that was most distressing, because I had seen how quickly women had rallied at ASU, and I had just assumed that would happen and suddenly I realized there was a conflict between staff and faculty and the whole status thing was involved. Even among the faculty it was, were you an instructor or full professor, that kind of thing. I just did not operate that way, and still don't perceive myself in those terms.

JS: So some of the traditional kinds of concerns such as status and politics transcended any sort of community based upon gender?

JT: Oh yes.

JS: And that must have been frustrating to work under.

JT: Well it was frustrating because again that had not been my experience; that's not how I perceived the world. I didn't know quite what to say or do that would make people feel comfortable, that it really could work, because if it hadn't have been your experience naturally you'd be careful of it.

JS: So you feel like that the budget and support was not as strong as it could have been?

JT: Well I think we were very fortunate getting what we did, but as we attempted to move forward, peoples' fears and so forth worked on them and so even support that was initially there faded.

JS: Did you have physical space and facilities and staff specifically in the environment?

JT: Yes.

JS: How much in terms of staff, do you remember?

JT: Well, actually just the person who was my secretary, although I think we called her a coordinator.

JS: So there was a physical area where women could come to use materials?

JT: Well, actually it was still the dean's office. The last year that I was there we finally got an office for the Associated Women Students and the files were moved over to that office.

JS: Do you think that was a conscious attempt to keep the influence of the Environ down by not promoting it?

JT: Possibly.

JS: Okay, we've been talking about your background and coming to Weber, and the hopes you had, your feeling toward the school at the time, your perceptions of what was going on. We talked about the Women's Environ Institute and what you hoped to do, that sort of thing. Let's turn our attention specifically from that to the attitudes you perceived on campus at that time. We talked a little bit about the

lack of "class consciousness" among women particularly at the faculty level.

What about women students at Weber, where were they in the 1970's?

JT: I was really impressed with them. They were generally unschooled and undisciplined, but it was very exciting. You know every year there is a turnover among student leaders, and some who you work with throughout their student days leave. But every year there is a turnover, and it was very exciting for me to see how hungry they were to learn how to be good leaders and to do the best possible jobs in their programs. And just to see them get involved, of course, gave me a great deal of satisfaction. And so I believe that for women students the potential was there, and they were eager for it. I just think it has a lot to do with timing. I'm the kind of person -- and this may be wrong, quote unquote, in terms of administrative style -- who gets in and works elbow to elbow with the students on whatever they were doing, even if it meant staying late and so forth. I think many of them felt like they could relate to me as a person and a friend as well as the dean and advisor.

JS: That's partially because you were not that much older than they were.

JT: I think that certainly had something to do with that, and I took full advantage of it.

JS: So in a way you felt a little bit hesitant about that and yet in a way it really helped you relate better. What about a sorority system; was that strong there?

JT: Yes, and it was local sororities; there were no national sororities although there were national fraternities. We did reexamine that, and one year we very seriously looked at the possibility of going national, but the local social sororities had such deep roots and strong alumni, that never did really happen. We did start one or

two professional sororities that were attached with the school of business and so forth. But in terms of the social sororities they stayed local. We did have two emerge for awhile, but they didn't exist after a couple of years.

JS: Two of the social sororities?

JT: Yes, new local ones. I think we were able to create an atmosphere where those that were not satisfied could go out and try something new and experience things.

JS: The kind of things we have been talking about involved traditional college students. What about those women on the campus that didn't fit into that model? Were there some, and what did you see your role to be?

JT: Talking about this just brought to mind one of the concerns I had about my job description which specified that I was to be an advisor to the sororities. I was very honest from the start, and I told them, "I don't believe in the sorority system and I think you ought to know that. But I also don't have to be a 100 percent for something to help it succeed. So I will not allow that to get in the way." And I don't think it did. I had very good relationships with the officers of all the organizations, and I think we had good rushes and quality activities and so forth. In fact, we created a counsel which had not been happening before, the fraternities had been meeting separately and the sororities had been meeting separately. One of the things that I pushed for were that they meet together. I was concerned that the men would run it, but that's natural when you're trying to encourage change.

JS: Is that what happened?

JT: Initially, but we negotiated ways so that the women could get involved and the leadership was shared.

JS: What about these non-traditional women though?

JT: Okay. There was another organization that I really put a lot of time and money in and that was the Associated Women Students, AWS. Because I had worked at ASU with a woman who was involved on the national level with the Intercollegiate Association of Women Students, I had a good role model in terms of what could happen. I got them involved in going to the national meetings and taking some of their materials so they could share and get information about what was going on at other campuses and encourage the women. We were successful in having some national officers among the students from our campus, regional as well. So, they were able to experience success from their participation. I think they were non-traditional -- I won't say non-traditional, to me they are more traditional than the sorority women -- were less traditional, and maybe a bit elite. And AWS examined that and said they didn't want to be another sorority because those needs were already being met by these five sororities. So they asked, "Who needs our attention?" At that time they started special programs for women students, and sponsored married student's week, and they got married women who were students on campus to be involved in the planning of the nature of that week. They began to examine the special problems that married women do have in attending school: of course babysitting is one, and also not really feeling, because they are married, that they are a part of the campus. Also, there were specific activities where they could bring the whole family.

JS: So there was recognition of the differences among women students?

JT: Oh yes, it was really exciting to see that grow, and see the married students and the non-married students working together. Even though their needs were different, they were committed to meeting each other's needs, and the non-married students had fun as they watched how successful that kind of a program was. Another thing that was initiated was the "putting hubby through" diploma that they handed out about graduation time, and so the women students initiated "putting wife through" diplomas recognizing at the same time the husbands who were supportive of them as they went through school. The first year was a tremendous surprise to the husbands and it was fun to see their reactions and there were a lot of tender experiences because of that program.

JS: That's interesting.

JT: Whether or not that's still going on I don't know.

JS: I get the impression, as I read the back issues of the *Signpost*, that Weber State stayed pretty much oblivious to many of the things that were happening on most college campuses in the 1960's. I don't see evidence of a strong anti-war movement or much of a black movement during those years.

JT: Wasn't that typical in Utah?

JS: There was some anti-war activity at the University of Utah and Utah State but there didn't seem to be any at Weber. There didn't seem to be the same kinds of concerns about the role of the educational system with regard to the role of the students that was evident elsewhere. Is that an accurate perception do you think?

JT: Well I think the nature of the institution is different, people have felt satisfied there because the institution's needs were their needs for a number of reasons. For most of the students it was kind of a community college, you know going to a college in the same town where they grew up with all the high school buddies and so forth. So there is a lot of inbreeding, and it's very provincial. I can remember the first time that I took some of the women students to a national convention; I don't think any one of them had ever been on an airplane, or traveled to Chicago, which is where we went. So there was a lot of ethnocentrism not just in Utah, but in that little valley.

JS: How much of that do you think is a fact that the school is overwhelmingly Mormon?

JT: I think that certainly might have been an influence.

JS: Do you feel that the LDS Institute exerted a significant influence on the campus? In other words did the Institute exist as kind of a separate social center?

JT: Yes. During my first year there, I was invited to the Church Office Building in Salt Lake City to visit with Elaine Cannon and the people from the Young Women and Young Men boards, to talk about the impact of the institute program, and the LDS sorority and fraternity programs. And, again very naively, I walked in and told them exactly what I thought, because I thought they really wanted the information. Having participated actively in the Institute at ASU myself (when I say that I mean actively, only to the extent of my church activity, socially it was not a part of my life), I felt that that kind of structuring was very unfortunate because it became an escape hatch, and often Mormon students at ASU were

not involved in what was happening on campus. They were frightened by it, particularly during the whole Mormon-Black controversy.

JS: Which was a big issue at Arizona State?

JT: A very big issue. I can remember going to a meeting around this issue, the only Mormon there, having both black and whites there, but being the only Mormon there in spite of the large Mormon population.

And so I wasn't buying into that fear because I thought this is the world, the society, and if I'm going to be a responsible citizen I've got to hopefully be a part of solving the problem. And I can't do it if I hide in a corner and keep reinforcing how special and different I am from the rest of the world. So I felt that in terms of religious education it was important to me to be able to take my religious courses along with my academic courses. Church activities are fine, but I felt it was irresponsible for them to create parallel activities when they should be involved on campus. And also, because of my bias against the sororities and fraternities, I said that I was appalled at the fact that the Church would even create such things as an example of having to mimic the world.

JS: That didn't go over too well I take it?

JT: Well, I didn't realize that Elaine Cannon was responsible for creating the women's sorority, so I'm sure she was a bit surprised by what I had to say about the sororities.

JS: But do you think that the Mormons of the school played a role?

JT: Not just with the students but I think in the faculty and administration too.

JS: What about the quality of the faculty overall?

JT: My interaction with them, I suppose, tended to be with those who were identified as liberals. I got to know them better than those who were a little bit quiet and maybe more traditional. Although I left with the label of liberal, I entered with the perception that I was a conservative. When you're trying to make changes, and create new kinds of conditions, it's very natural to go immediately to the people who seem most flexible and seem to generate ideas and have enthusiasm. I wasn't really even looking for support; I was simply looking for people who were secure enough to exchange ideas.

JS: You mentioned the fact that Mormonism influenced not only the student body but also the faculty. What sort of schism was there between Mormon and non-Mormon on campus?

JT: It was real, very real. I didn't see a lot of hostility, but maybe I didn't because I was as comfortable in my association with non-Mormons. In fact most of my friends there on the faculty were non-Mormons.

JS: Did you ever feel that there were people on the faculty or in the administration who were Mormons, who felt that what you were doing was not in line with what they would like to see done and wondered about whether or not your commitment to Mormonism was strong enough?

JT: I didn't feel that much. I was not raised in Utah, and even though at Arizona State I was involved very closely with the church (I was Relief Society President down there, and worked on a couple of stake boards and things like that), I still tended on a daily basis to be associated with non-Mormons. The administrators I worked for were not LDS; none of the faculty that I was working with were LDS. Having

grown up out of Utah that was fine, that was comfortable, because where I lived in Walla Walla we were a minority; that was a given. And I was very comfortable in that context. I can remember two or three months after I moved to Utah writing a letter home saying, "I have the distinct feeling that there is an attitude in this state among the Mormons regarding how women should be behaving. And I am not fitting that mold, but I don't understand what that mold is." So I think that very definitely was coming into play.

JS: Were you active in the church while you were at Weber?

JT: Yes, I was active in my ward. I did not go to a campus ward; I attended the ward I lived in.

JS: Were any of the ward leaders also college personnel?

JT: I don't recall. I do remember one who might have been in the administration or at the institute in that ward. There was one other family that was in the student personnel area also, Don Jensen and his family; we were in the same ward.

JS: So there was at least a perception on some people's part that you were active in the church at the same time. How would you describe the qualities of the student body up there?

JT: Well, as I mentioned, I think that generally they were undisciplined in that they had a lot of energy but it needed channeling to help them gain skills so they could accomplish what they wanted. This didn't seem to be going on, even though there were youth leadership conferences and so forth. We had a good cross section of those who were academically not very capable and needed special attention, clear through to the very bright student in academics and

generally involved in extracurricular activities. I liked the student body because of the ethnic mixture, and I was involved very much with Indians, Blacks and Chicanos. I was very involved with ethnic groups at ASU and enjoyed it. So I was glad to see there was some of that ethnic mixture at Weber, and I was very aware of how much I had come to appreciate it when I made the change from Weber to BYU and missed it again.

JS: When I was in high school and college in the 60's everybody said that Weber State College was "Harrison High." Was it Harrison High?

JT: I don't know what Harrison High was.

JS: Well, Harrison High meant that Weber was not quite as rigorous as a university, the students were not quite as serious and the teachers were not quite as good, and things were just a little bit small time.

JT: Well, again I wouldn't have that perspective because I did not grow up there and didn't have a lot of the attitudes, so I didn't come in with that perspective.

JS: I see.

JT: When I taught classes I expected the students to work and they did. Some of them were lazy, but most of them were very bright and exciting and creative. So, I didn't have that attitude, though I heard it a lot and I didn't have an opportunity to really evaluate faculty because I was more often in administrative meeting and not faculty meetings, nor did I go in and observe their classes.

JS: Do you think that there was a healthy vital intellectual life on campus?

JT: Well I was a part of one; whether that was unique, I suspect it might have been. But for a year there was about a dozen of us on the faculty who studied the Great

Books together, got together once a week etc.; I found that exciting and stimulating. Occasionally I would sit in on a class just because I was interested, or happened to find people who are also interested. But I don't know what it was like for anybody else.

JS: You came to Weber under President William Miller. What sort of a person was he?

JT: I instantly liked the man. Before I was even hired, my feeling was that he was very fatherly, very human in the way he cared about people and believed that people did count. My assumption was possibly he cared about people at the expense of the organization.

JS: He cared a little too much?

JT: When Weber was smaller maybe that was fine, because there really was a family feeling, you know, we were just one big family, but it came to the point where the institution was like a plane at the end of a runway ready to take off. And that's why it was exciting to come to Weber when I did.

JS: There were some forces trying to hold the plane back, but there was a lot of propulsion to get the plane off the ground.

JT: Yes, there was a lot of that youthful excitement pushing it to move forward.

JS: Do you think President Miller recognized that, and recognized that perhaps he was perceived as part of the old guard? Now he left because of his health problems, but do you think he would have left at approximately the same time anyway?

JT: Well I had the feeling that had he not had the heart attack he probably would have stayed, I think two more years beyond what he did and then retired maybe as a teacher or whatever.

JS: Maybe he would have at least stayed until he was 65 or something?

JT: Yes.

JS: What about -- well, I was going to ask you to compare Miller and Bishop, but let's hold on for that a minute. Let's talk about some other people. What about Helmut Hofmann? What are your perceptions of him?

JT: I think that he was probably perceived in a stereotypical way. He was from Germany, and he seemed to have a very official manner about him. But because I had lived in Austria and worked in my schooling with my voice coach and so forth, with people who appeared to be that way...I know I had some stereotypical assumptions and in the course of getting to know them, and dropping some of my views and allowing myself to get to know people on an individual, personal basis, I really found that they were sensitive and bright and all those things. So when I met Dr. Hofmann, instead of making the typical assumptions that I think some people were making about him, I jumped past them.

JS: I see.

JT: And I just felt an instant warmth and friendship from him.

JS: He was supportive of what you were trying to do?

JT: I don't recall at that point seeking his support because I was not involved yet (though my intentions were at some point to get involved) in the academic area.

JS: So you were under what vice president?

JT: Initially, Robert Clarke was the vice president over our area. The first year, when President Miller was in, I dealt only with Alan Dayley. Then when President Bishop came my dealings were pretty much with him directly.

JS: With Bishop? Was there kind of an open door policy on the part of Miller as President, or do you feel there was a more formal structure under Miller than there was under Bishop?

JT: I felt that Miller was more formal, more traditional.

JS: But more approachable?

JT: Yes, I felt that. I know that among those that I worked with many felt that maybe he wasn't moving forward as quickly as they would have liked. They felt that they wanted new programs and so forth and things weren't happening as quickly as they would have liked. It was generally a fairly young staff, even though they were maybe ten years older than my age, still it was a young staff.

JS: Was Hofmann the most powerful person in the administration besides Miller, particularly when Miller was incapacitated?

JT: I perceived him that way, but also I think Folger was.

JS: Jim Folger?

JT: Right.

JS: Was there much conflict between Hofmann and Folger do you think?

JT: I have no idea; I don't know anything about that.

JS: We've been discussing your perceptions about the key people in the Miller administration; let's turn our attention now to President Bishop. What was your initial impression of Joseph Bishop?

JT: I was excited, and felt with a new person changes could take place. I wasn't the only one who had ideas about what could happen on that campus; so there was a lot of eagerness on the part of people that with a change of presidents maybe a lot of significant changes could take place. All of us who were administrators were called into his office for an interview and he asked us three questions.

JS: Which were?

JT: What do you perceive as the strength of this institution? What do you perceive as the weaknesses? What are your professional goals? When he looked me in the eye and asked me what my professional goal was, I looked him in the eye and I said, "In ten years I expect to be where you are." And at that point I began to sense what I was up against, because his views were not only Mormon, but very traditional.

JS: Are you saying that he was a chauvinist?

JT: Well, yes. I think he made the typical, condescending remarks; he did not take me seriously. I could just see this mysterious look on his face: "Who is this woman? What is this woman saying?" But initially there was a good feeling, I think, between us.

JS: That was pretty general campus-wide too, wasn't it?

JT: Yes. But, I began to have some concern when he called me in for a second meeting, and at that meeting quizzed me about faculty women in two departments on the campus, as to whether or not they were lesbians. I found the whole conversation very disturbing because I had never heard of such a thing, I mean that there were any active women on the faculty that were lesbians, and I

didn't understand where he got the information, or why he had decided to talk with me. And in the course of the conversation, he asked if there were any students that were lesbians. I told him I was aware that there were some, because some had come to me for counseling, and I was sure that probably the counseling department was handling some of that.

JS: But you don't have any idea why he was asking you these questions?

JT: I finally asked him, and he said that he had gotten the information from Bill Carver that there were faculty women on campus who were lesbians, and asked if, because of my job, I knew anything about this. And I also had the feeling that he was questioning me too, possibly because of my interest in the concerns of women and the whole stereotype that goes along with that; the assumptions that people make. I really got angry at that point and said, "If you're asking me if I'm a lesbian, I am not. As far as counseling with young women who are struggling with this issue, I see that as perfectly within the limits of my job responsibilities as well as my training as a counselor, and I will not reveal who those individuals are because I have a professional responsibility not to." I told him I was not aware of any faculty women who had made that choice. I became very upset about the conversation, and I abruptly excused myself and left. I immediately went to my office and called the women who Bishop had named and let them know that I had had this conversation with the president, that I was very upset, and that I thought it was very inappropriate on his part. I also asked them why in the world there seemed to be this big witch-hunt for lesbians. I felt a responsibility both as a professional and as a woman to let them know.

JS: How did they respond to that?

JT: They were amazed, absolutely amazed, and hurt and scared because many of the women, like myself, were single and they were also somewhat older than I, and so they had lived with that longer than I. I had never confronted that before in my life.

JS: Did President Bishop express some feeling that he was interested in this because, if there were such people on campus, they were a threat to the students?

JT: He said that we just couldn't have that kind of activity occurring on campus, and I said I wasn't aware it was.

JS: When was this in terms of a time frame?

JT: At the very beginning of his presidency.

JS: He hadn't been president very long?

JT: No, the first year, in the early months of his presidency.

JS: Within a few months after he took over.

JT: One faculty member that I talked with did say during the course of a conversation that either two or three years prior to that they had had a problem with an individual on the faculty, but that the person was no longer at the institution. And to her knowledge there was just not any of that going on. I thought the whole thing was very ugly.

JS: Kind of bizarre?

JT: Yes, to me it was bizarre because it was really my initial exposure to that kind of attitude about a single woman who might be committed to the concerns of

women. Of course, all the other women were not even necessarily involved with women's issues. And so I thought it was unprofessional and frightening. I was concerned that people were going around digging this kind of stuff up and not even being sensitive to the way that they were handling it, making accusations seemingly without any information. I resented it then and I still do.

JS: So your relationships with President Bishop got off to kind of a bad start. What about his general attitude toward the Environ and what you were doing?

JT: I worked with him, and we spent a lot of time in meetings. He did support it, and he supported my going to the Institutional Council. He supported the budget for it. But I got the feeling that the more successful my efforts became, the less he was willing to support it.

JS: Why's that?

JT: Well, I don't know. I really do not understand to this day what occurred between us professionally.

JS: How did Bishop differ from Miller in terms of administrative style?

JT: He gave the feeling that it was "open door"; call him Joe, not president; we were one of the guys and all of that; but his behavior did not buy the respect that people felt for President Miller.

JS: Some people suggested that part of his problem was that he was way in over his head, that he was not equal to the job. Do you think that a fair characterization?

JT: Well, if I hadn't had some of the experiences I had with him, I might agree. No, I'd have to say that I saw him do things which I thought were very malicious. An example of that would be the type of humor he displayed in front of people. It was

destructive humor: he'd make fun of their baldness, their weight, where they received their degree, if they had a speech impediment, etc. He did not know how to relate to people and so his humor was very destructive. And, I felt that he was a person without a sense of morality, of what was right and wrong. He was almost amoral.

JS: You don't mean that in a sexual sense but in an ethical sense?

JT: Just in the way he dealt with people.

JS: Like making commitments that he didn't intend to keep, that sort of thing?

JT: Yes. And he would intentionally lie. On occasion he would tell me something and then he would say, "if anybody asks me, if you don't keep this confidential, if someone comes back and asks me, I'll tell them I don't even know what they're talking about."

JS: Do you think there was a feeling, a year or so after he became president, on the part of some people, that they had made a mistake. Did the efforts to get rid of him as president begin that early?

JT: On the part of some, yes. There were attempts to talk with Institutional Council members and legislators.

JS: Where do you think the anti-Bishop sentiment was coming from, within the administration or the faculty?

JT: I saw evidence of it in every segment of campus. I think administrators who had to work with him made a genuine, professional attempt to do that, but those that weren't close to him, or weren't part of the administration, were more willing to take the risk in terms of overt activity.

JS: Do you think there was a Mormon, non-Mormon element to it?

JT: I think that didn't emerge until later, yet there was a very strong feeling, and some resentment toward the Mormon elements. The fact that this man was a Mormon, and was doing what was perceived as unethical and destructive and hurtful kinds of things, was just so inconsistent with what was being put out, as what a good Mormon would do. So it made both Mormons and non-Mormons very angry.

JS: I guess he wore his Mormonness pretty much on his sleeve?

JT: Oh yes, and that was his problem. The only administrative model he seemed to be aware of, in spite of his training, was the model that's used in the Church which cannot be used in society successfully. Even though there are aspects of bureaucracy in both, it just takes a different kind of style than the priesthood approach when you deal with secular issues.

JS: So your saying that the Mormon, non-Mormon split was part of it but it wasn't the major factor.

JT: No, I don't think so.

JS: There came a time when professional relationships between you and President Bishop reached the point where you threatened legal action.

JT: That's right, in fact I initiated it.

JS: Why don't you tell us about how that developed?

JT: Well, initially I was given the message that Bishop was very interested in opening things up for women, and that he indeed wanted to make some changes. And, he took some steps like supporting the Environ and so forth. But personally, he couldn't make those moves; it just wasn't a part of his head, or behavior, or

experience, or his perception. I don't think he knew how to get out of that other than to undercut me.

JS: When you say "undercut me" what specifically do you mean?

JT: Well, I became aware that he would be talking to other faculty members about whether or not I was a competent person. And students would come to me and say they had been called in about me. He would always say to students now this is confidential. I just thought that kind of behavior was so unprofessional, and so destructive, and it really created a very difficult atmosphere under which to work.

JS: Was he shooting at you, was he shooting at the program, or both?

JT: Both, and at one point I learned in the rumor mill that Bishop had a list of enemies, and that I was on the list and I was the only woman. So I followed the rumor clear to Dean Hurst; it was supposed to have come from him who got it straight from Bishop. So I made an appointment with Dean Hurst and confronted him with this rumor. He was absolutely amazed that I even had that information, and he did not deny it. I made an appointment with President Bishop to talk with him about it. He would not see me so I ended up seeing his sidekick, Dwight Burrill, and he not only told me that it was true, that I was on the president's enemy list, he proceeded to read the rest of the list to me. And after about the third name I stopped him and said, "That is information I don't want and I think it's absolutely childish that this kind of thing is going on among grown-ups." It was incredible to me that this was even happening and it was at that point that I started referring to the whole atmosphere there as Webergate. And it became a pretty common reference.

JS: What about the charges of the wiretapping and those sorts of things, do you think these are true charges?

JT: Oh yes, I found out about those after I had engaged my lawyer. I filed under Title IX Executive Order and Title VII, Title IV and Equal Pay. The NEA on the national level got involved and I engaged a lawyer.

JS: Who was your attorney?

JT: Senator Darrell Renstrom. Soon after I engaged my lawyer another colleague in student personnel also engaged a lawyer. Our two lawyers were talking and comparing the facts that concerned our respective situations and the other lawyer revealed to my lawyer that wiretapping was going on. It was really shattering because that very day I had an appointment with my lawyer to bring some information and when I got to work my whole office had been gone through, all my files, my desk, everything. And I realized it could have been paranoia on my part, but I suspected that if in fact my phone wasn't being tapped, my conversations could have been listened to which was very easy to do because of the way the phones were arranged in the office. It got to the point, especially after that conversation with my lawyer, that I had no significant conversations on my phone. I'd always go to the pay phones in the Union Building.

JS: Now what was the legal action that you initiated specifically?

JT: It was based upon discrimination regarding equal pay and working conditions.

JS: What did you hope to achieve out of that?

JT: Well, to try to get Bishop off my back! [laughter]

JS: Was there a larger issue involved? Did you feel if he were successful harassing you, he would then begin to harass others?

JT: Oh sure.

JS: And then intimidate other women.

JT: Not just women; I mean his whole style was affecting a lot of people; and a lot of people that I cared about.

JS: What was the attitude of people on the faculty and staff towards what you were doing?

JT: Publically, I became ostracized. It was a tremendously threatening kind of step to take, but I would not let up, I simply would not cave in on it, and I was determined to see it through to the end. Privately there were all kinds of supportive phone calls, people meeting me off campus, notes to my house, etc.; they were behind me all the way. But it was important for me not to look back because publically they weren't going to be there. That kind of thing. So there was a lot of support and, references made like "Jan of Ark" and "Super Woman," stuff like that. It was very confusing to me; I couldn't understand the fear. And when I'd confront people, particularly those that I worked with, they would say, "You don't have a family, you're not trying to buy a home; it's okay if you take those kinds of risks but we can't; we've got wives, children and mortgages; we can't afford to take those kinds of risks." None of that made any sense to me.

JS: What was the impact of what you were trying to do? I mean, did it make it difficult for you to communicate with students or others?

JT: The students were beautiful, in fact they really helped to just really get me through it. They were so supportive because they knew me, I mean they knew that when they needed someone to go to bat for them I did, and the programs that we did were successful and they had good experiences. They were just tremendously supportive. I thought the irony of it was that those who were viewed as immature were acting so much more maturely than those that were supposed to have gained some wisdom in life's experience.

JS: So ultimately you settled out of court?

JT: Yes. Looking back, the decision I made to settle everything out of court was a good decision for a couple of reasons. One was that eventually I was able to get what I wanted and what I felt I should deserve in terms of my salary, and my title and everything else. And the other reason was that I didn't want to make a big public issue out of it. I genuinely felt sorry for the man's wife and kids. And I felt that it would be publicly embarrassing to him. I don't know why I cared about him that much. Although I got everything I wanted, the atmosphere became so poisoned, it was apparent that while I had won, in many ways I lost. I was aware of it, and I knew that was the risk I was taking, but it was a very painful thing to go through. I was being confronted with the reality of a world I had never had to confront before. What people will do for their own egos, what people won't do, even if they believe some things are right. It was just a real wrenching kind of experience.

JS: Looking back on it, if you had to do it all over again would you do it differently?

JT: You mean would I have initiated legal action? You bet, and I would have gone all the way through court.

JS: You wouldn't have settled out of court?

JT: No I would not, and I do not advise people to do it now. Since that incident I have been involved in one way or the other with two hundred similar kinds of incidents. And I tell people to go for it, if they understand the price they will have to pay. If I had it to do today I wouldn't settle out of court. I would go public, and I would use the media. I would make public that people on the Institutional Council said things to me in private and then turned around and informed Bishop about what I had said, but not what their responses to me were. As it was I had never entered into any kind of legal action before and it was frightening. That alone was frightening without having to face the way I was being treated.

JS: After you settled a job opportunity developed at BYU.

JT: About six or nine months before the whole thing was settled an opportunity opened up at BYU and I kept putting them off because they were well aware, not only of what had happened, but of the fact that I was in the process of legal action. That didn't seem to matter and so I kept putting them off and telling them that I was not interested in signing the contract until everything was resolved. I stuck to that.

JS: There was not much public perception of what was going on, it wasn't in the media, it wasn't in the *Signpost*.

JT: No, not that I'm aware of. I know *Signpost* reporters were investigating it. In fact, that student reporter was among those that Bishop called in, confidentially, and

gave all kinds of information about what was wrong with me. I also know of a reporter who now works in Salt Lake who investigated the case but has not published what she discovered. Eventually when I write all of this up, she has agreed to give me all her notes, cause it's just my memory I am going on.

JS: So this was all an internal thing?

JT: It really was.

JS: Was the perception fairly broad on campus of what was going on?

JT: Oh the gossip mill was just incredible! Yeah, people thought they knew what was going on. You know it's a small place; no matter what happens, the minute it happens everybody knows.

JS: So you left Weber then and went to BYU?

JT: Right.

JS: That was in 1974?

JT: Yes.

JS: President Bishop stayed on four more years and things became increasingly worse in terms of criticism of him on campus.

JT: Yes, and not only that but the very things that I had initially drawn to the attention of some of these Institutional Council members, became public issues.

JS: So it did become public at a later date?

JT: Yes, much later. There were a lot of people trying to keep the lid on, and they were successful for awhile. There were a lot of rumors going around. One rumor was that Bishop was one of the "fair haired boys" of the Church, purposely brought to Weber by Monson and Packer, and the reason it was very difficult to

get rid of him was because of that influence. Now I don't know if some of that came out of the non-Mormon camp but I heard it from the Mormons too.

JS: It's probably a good thing that the BYU job came along, because don't you think that your credibility had been weakened, at least with the administration.

Wouldn't have it been difficult personally for you to continue on at Weber?

JT: Sure, because of the nature of the administrative changes that had taken place, people that I considered to be against me were in key positions. Responsible, honest individuals were done away with and people who would stoop to almost anything were in positions of responsibility. And I just wasn't willing to work with that kind of situation.

JS: Looking back on your years at Weber, on balance do you think it was a good experience?

JT: Yes, I loved it; even considering the pain I went through the last year. I loved my responsibilities, I loved working with the students and I had some very good friendships. We had a really close unit and we could argue with each other, and disagree with each other, but still work as a team. I did and still do respect those individuals. I just loved the possibilities I saw for the institution, and the opportunity for me to really find out who I was and to see the successes. And there were a lot of successes. I received national recognition in terms of the Environ and regional recognition from government offices. That was reinforcing. I hadn't done it for the recognition, but not only was I enjoying my job but I was also getting some icing on the cake along the way! Up until probably two or three

years ago, I expected at some point I might go back to Weber; at this point I doubt very much that I would even be interested.

JS: Why, is that because of where you are or where Weber is?

JT: Both.

JS: But you still have some fond memories at least.

JT: I do have some very fond feelings toward the campus, for individuals who are still very good friends and for a lot of former students I'm still in contact with. I still get wedding announcements, or children's birth announcements, or an occasional letter saying, "I finished another degree" or "I've moved to Alaska" or a note saying, "I was doing the dishes and I remembered this experience and what a good experience it was." So you know it was a gratifying time, it really was.

JS: Do you think the programs for women have developed the way they would have had you stayed, or has this whole experience hurt that development. In other words, what happened after you left? Who took over your job? And is that person, or that person's successor, continuing to push the same kinds of things that you were pushing or have those things kind of been pushed aside?

JT: The only thing that I'm aware of that has continued is the strong affiliation with the Associated Women Students at the national level and that pleases me because I've been serving as an advisor to that body. So I'm aware that some activity has continued; beyond that I don't know, I really haven't kept in touch. One of the agreements of my leaving was that the name Women's Environ Institute went with me, and the institution was no longer to use that name.

JS: Is there anything else that you would like to add about what we've discussed any other last thoughts on your years there or what the future holds in terms of women's programs particularly at the college?

JT: I really don't know what's happening with women students, but I think it's too bad that in this day and age that faculty and women students can't be a part of a self determining kind of organization. I look back on Weber as a very pleasant, exciting, stimulating, growth-promoting, rewarding time and really wish that I had all the answers of why things went the way they did. The best I can come up with is, I think it was a combination of the personality of the president and myself, and the times. We were talking about things as they relate to women fairly early in the consciousness of it all in the state of Utah.

JS: That's right.

JT: And I suppose the fact that I was single, and that I was young, and maybe a little too idealistic and naive in my basic beliefs about people affected things. You know I really expected better than I experienced, and it was a very disillusioning time. But it was also a time when I found out who my friends really were.

JS: I appreciate the information you know that you've given us, not only about your own experiences but the growth and development of women's programs at the college.

ORAL HISTORY

GIFT AND RELEASE AGREEMENT

I, Jan L. Tyler, the undersigned, of
Salt Lake City, Utah, hereby grant, convey,
and transfer to the Stewart Library, Weber State College, an educational
institution, all my right, title, interest, and literary property
rights in and to my oral history interview recorded on March 11,
19 80, to be used for scholarly purposes.

- ☒ Open and usable after my review
☐ Closed for a period of _____ years
☐ Closed for my lifetime
☐ Closed for my lifetime except with permission
from me or my designated representative

Date

15 January 1982

Jan L. Tyler
(signature of interviewee)

John A. Hunt
(signature of interviewer)

